

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/828,362	04/05/2001	Alpaslan Gence Savas	259/056	1709	
7:	590 01/14/2005		EXAMINER		
David E. Bennett			DEAN, RAYMOND S		
Coats & Benne 1400 Crescent	,		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
Suite 300			2684		
Cary, NC 275	511		DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

٦			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/828,362	SAVAS, ALPASLAN GENCE	
,, ,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Raymond S Dean	2684	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	;
THE REPLY FILED 20 December 2004 FAILS TO PL Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	o avoid abandonment of this appli (1) a timely filed amendment white peal (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper reply to ch places the application	a in
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the m b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of the notes event, however, will the statutory period for reply exp ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY with 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the perifee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See Section 1.11 in the period of the control of the contr	nis Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for ire later than SIX MONTHS from the mail VAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 Cod of extension and the corresponding and the shortened statutory period for reploffice later than three months after the m	ing date of the final rejection. THE FINAL REJECTION. See FR 1.136(a) and the appropriation of the fee. The appropriaty originally set in the final Office.	MPEP te extension ate extension e action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.192(a)).			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	d because:		
 (a) they raise new issues that would require fu (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Not (c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or 	te below);	,	fying the
(d) they present additional claims without cand NOTE:	celing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej	ection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wo canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	uld be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely filed ame	endment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT pla	ace the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	pecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were ne	wly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendm explanation of how the new or amended claims			an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	vs:		
Claim(s) allowed: None.			
Claim(s) objected to: 5,7,14,19,20,25,26,30,31,36	<u>37.</u>		
Claim(s) rejected: 1 - 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 - 13, 15, 16 - 1	8, 21 - 24, 27 - 29, and 32 - 35.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) a	pproved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stater	ment(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:		0×10	

NAY MAUNG SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Raymond S. Dean January 5, 2005 Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In order to ensure that the payload of Chang is comprised of error-less LTUs the number of LTUs that are in error will be determined for the purpose of discarding said LTUs. LTUs comprise MuxPDUs, which are units of data that are transmitted in a frame. The said frame is transmitted via a radio link thus if the transmit power is too low there can be an error in said data unit and therefore an error in said LTU. The LTU error therefore can be an indicator of the performance of said radio link. Chen and Chang both teach a wireless CDMA system that uses frame payloads to transmit and receive data. Chen further teaches some other performance criteria or quality indicator other than FER that can be used to adjust the set point. It is also very well known by those of ordinary skill in the art that said frame payload comprise MuxPDUs and that said MuxPDUs are grouped into LTUs thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the measure of LTU errors taught in Chang in the CDMA system of Chen as another performance criteria and such that only the LTUs with an error will be discarded thus allowing all of the error free LTUs to be transferred to the upper layers as correctly received data thus enabling much more efficient data transmission as taught by Chang.